



PLANNING BOARD

Linda K. Hamlin, Chairman
Steven A. Heikin, Clerk
Robert Cook
Blair Hines
Sergio Modigliani
Matthew Oudens
Mark J. Zarrillo

Town of Brookline Massachusetts

Town Hall, Third Floor
333 Washington Street
Brookline, MA 02445
(617) 730-2130
www.brooklinema.gov

**BROOKLINE PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Room 111, First Floor, Brookline Town Hall
June 16, 2016 – 7:30 p.m.**

Board Present: Linda Hamlin, Steven Heikin, Robert Cook, Blair Hines (departed 9p.m),
and Mark Zarrillo

Staff Present: Polly Selkoe, Maria Morelli, Ashley Clark

Chair Linda Hamlin called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

BOARD OF APPEALS CASES

12 Clearwater Road – convert garage to habitable space and construct an attached rear shed requiring side and rear yard setback, FAR, parking design and design review relief (7/7) Pct. 16

Ashley Clark presented the case.

The applicant and architect Matthew Gifford described the proposal with his attorney, Robert Allen.

Attorney Allen argued the proposed alternative does not change the streetscape; it allows the applicant to expand in place, and does not displace vehicles. Attorney Allen described the dimensions of the garage as too small to appropriately fit a car.

Matt Gifford presented the design and explained that he would like to give his family more space in the house.

Robert Cook was sympathetic to the applicant's intent and did not feel a precedent would be set by allowing this conversion. The other board members were in agreement.

There was consensus among the board that the garage was too small for a vehicle.

Steven Heikin felt this was a reasonable proposal considering the size of the lot.

Linda Hamlin suggested altering the slope of the shed roof to be continued with the garage roof. She also suggested that the applicant consider including landscaping at the front of the house as counterbalancing amenities.

There was no public comment.

Linda Hamlin motioned to recommend approval.

Mark Zarrillo seconded the motion.

Voted (5-0): the Planning Board is in support of the addition of the shed at the rear but recommends denial of the site plan submitted by Stephen P. Desroche dated 3/15/2016, and architectural renderings submitted by Matthew Gifford and dated 5/2/2016, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final site plan, elevations, and floor plans subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan indicating all counterbalancing amenities, subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final floor plans and elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect; 4) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

24 Holland Road – construct a rear addition requiring front and side yard setback relief (7/7) Pct. 14

Polly Selkoe presented the case and informed the applicant that they would need to seek guidance from the Preservation Department in regards to demolition.

Bob Wheeler, the architectural designer, described the project and the conditions of the road.

Steven Heikin asked about missing details and the basement.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jacob Walters, representing Constantine Tsomides, a resident at 121 Seaver Street, described his client's view into the 24 Holland Road property under discussion. Attorney Walters shared that his client has not received correspondence in regards to this case beyond formal town notices. He requested the Planning Board consider stipulating in their conditions additional landscaping screening to mitigate any negative impact on his client's view. Further, his client is opposed to this project, feels it is too large, and feels more privacy should be expected of an S-15 zoning district.

Carlos Ridruejo, 16 Holland Road: had no objections to the addition. He described the conditions as paved and thus did not see an impact on the existing landscaping or impact on the environment.

The board discussed the roof design, felt it was sloping away from the neighbor at 121 Seaver Street and therefore should have minimal impact.

Samuel Comerchero, 51 Holland Road, described a large wooded section of landscaping between the two homes [16 Holland and 24 Holland]. Mr. Comerchero did not feel the project would have a lot of impact on the neighbors and feels like it would be a nice addition.

Steven Heikin had concern regarding the unfinished basement with direct access to the house and windows. Mr. Heikin would like to see a basement plan. He felt the FAR proposed is well within what is allowable, though including the basement brings the total FAR close to the limit.

The applicant explained they intend on using this space for storage and are willing to do landscaping. They would be agreeable to putting landscaping on Mr. Tsomides' property to which he was amenable.

The board discussed with the applicant additional information they would require before continuing on to the ZBA. They would like a floor plan for the basement including a square footage calculation. The board also advised the applicant that they need to revise their drawings to better communicate their intent.

There was consensus among the board that the slope of the design is moving away from the neighbors and would have a minimal impact on them, taking into consideration the setback relief and existing landscaping. The board advised the applicant to work with the neighbors on a landscape plan that is agreeable to all parties.

Polly Selkoe agreed to work out details with the applicant and neighbor.

*Linda Hamlin motioned to recommend approval.
Steven Heikin seconded the motion.*

Voted (5-0): the Planning Board recommends approval of the site plan submitted by Paul J Tyrell, dated 3/15/2016, and floor plans and elevations submitted by Bob Wheeler, dated 4/18/2016, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall submit a final site plan, floor plans including the basement, and elevations including final building materials, subject to review and approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning.
2. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscape plan showing screening of the addition from the rear abutter, subject to review and approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final floor plans and building elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

1248 Beacon Street – final design review of revised plans for previously approved case to construct a large addition Pct. 3

Attorney Jeffrey Allen and Steven Sousa, the architect, presented the design for 81 Boylston Street.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Susan Houston, 1258 Beacon Street, was in general support of the project. Ms. Houston felt the rectangular bay solution honors the street façade.

A resident appreciated the developer working with them through the design process and are in support of the project.

There was consensus among the board that the project has improved and there was general favorable support of the design.

*Linda Hamlin motioned to recommend approval.
Steven Heikin seconded the motion.*

Voted (5-0): If the Board of Appeals finds that the statutory requirements for a variance are met, the Planning Board approves the plans by Sousa Design, dated 1/22/16, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit final elevations, including façade materials and details, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Board.
- 2) Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final site plan, including parking, landscaping and counterbalancing amenities, and floor plans subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
- 3) Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final construction management plan, including location of construction vehicle parking, and name and cell number of project manager, subject to the review and approval of the Building Commissioner, with a copy submitted to the Planning Department.
- 4) Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final building elevations and floor plans stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence the decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON COMMENTS TO ZBA ON 1180 BOYLSTON STREET 40B PROPOSAL to replace prior gas/service station with a six-story building for 45 one and two-bedroom residential units (9 affordable and 36 market-rate) and one level of underground parking Pct. 15

Maria Morelli described the proposal for 1180 Boylston Street.

There will be a site visit June 29th at 8:30 a.m.

The board discussed the draft letter to the ZBA and commented on areas of concern.

There was a consensus that the zero setback condition was of major concern in regards to safety. Another concern is that the height and overall massing of the project is incongruous with the surrounding development pattern.

Traffic and parking were also addressed by the board. They did not feel the parking plan submitted was very well articulated in terms of functionality and logistics. Steven Heikin commented that there were inconsistencies between the parking consultation plan and CBT's plan.

The board had many questions which are still unanswered by the proposal in regards to trash removal and refuse storage. They suggested an additional header be included on this matter in the letter.

The board also had concerns about the loading bay impeding the public way.

A member of the public shared a health concern that he had with the parking plan because it implies that many cars will be idling while a valet moves them around. He would like to know the impact this will have on the air quality. He was also concerned about the impact this project will have on parking in neighboring streets because the current conditions are so constrained that he must sometimes park at a train station to find a place for his car in the evening.

The board agreed that the draft letter should incorporate its comment and be sent to the ZBA.

ANR SUBDIVISION PLANS – 24 Monmouth Court, 88 Laurel Road/37 Cedar Road, 12 Beaconsfield Road

24 Monmouth Court

A motion was made and seconded to endorse the plan as an ANR plan.

The Planning Board

Voted: to endorse the plan as an ANR plan.

88 Laurel Road/37 Cedar Road

A motion was made and seconded to endorse the plan as an ANR plan.

The Planning Board

Voted: to endorse the plan as an ANR plan.

12 Beaconsfield Road

A motion was made and seconded to endorse the plan as an ANR plan.

The Planning Board

Voted: to endorse the plan as an ANR plan.

The minutes of June 2nd were approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Materials Reviewed During Meeting: Staff Reports, Site Plans, and Elevations